

passes. Along a lower edge of the sign, a crank and ratchet assembly within a hollow lower frame member tensions the polymer material.

Differences between the sign of Coleman and Applicant's cabinet door that make a rejection of claim 17, as amended, under 35 USC 102(b) untenable are:

1) "said opposing side members each having a narrow slot in an inner edge thereof..."

2) "one of said upper and lower frame members having a slot extending between an inner edge and an outer edge of said frame, said slot extending at least a width of said open space," (underlining added)

3) "a groove along said outer edge communicating in parallel relation with said slot..." (underlining added)

4) In the other frame member, "a recess along an inner side thereof, and opposed notches at lower outer regions of said recess ..." (underlining added)

5) "a second tubular loop contiguous with and formed at the other end of said fabric sheet panel" (underlining added)

6) "one of said first tubular loop and said second tubular loop removably extending straight through said slot and residing in said groove in said one of said upper frame member and said lower frame member..." (underlining added)

7) "said fabric sheet panel extending into each said narrow slot of each of said opposed side members"

8) “a second dowel pin inserted through the other of said first loop and said second loop, with ends of said second dowel pin engaging said opposed notches of said recess...” (underlining added)

The above claim elements are not found in the reference to Coleman, and thus the rejection to claim 16 is contrary to MPEP 2131, (TO ANTICIPATE A CLAIM, THE REFERENCE MUST TEACH EVERY ELEMENT OF THE CLAIM) and to 35 USC 102(b).

The rejection to claim 18 suffers the same or similar deficiencies as noted above with respect to claim 17, and should be allowable for reasons set forth with respect to claim 17.

#### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103

Examiner has also rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman in view of Brandt (US 4127156). The reference to Brandt is relied on for the teaching of “made of wood”. However, this claim limitation has been relegated to dependent claims, and upon finding the base claims allowable, dependent claims should also be found allowable.

The addition of Brandt to Coleman does nothing to cure the deficiencies as noted above. Further, the references of Coleman and Brandt are directed to nonanalogous art. One of ordinary skill of the art of cabinetmaking would not turn to the arts of signs or screens for windows for guidance with respect to construction of cabinet doors, which necessarily are of finer and more polished construction than advertising signs and screens for

windows.

Dependent claims 19 – 25 are added with this amendment, and should be allowable upon their respective base claims being found allowable.

## CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the prior art does not fairly teach, suggest or infer a cabinet door wherein a fabric center panel is constructed having a looped construction at each end, with a dowel through both loops, and with one end supported by a slot extending through the frame member and a groove in an outer edge of the frame communicating with the slot, and an opposite end of the fabric panel supported by a dowel having ends supported by notches in a recess.

As this amendment is believed to place all the claims in condition for allowance, favorable action is respectfully requested. No new matter is added with this amendment. In the event there are outstanding issues that need to be resolved, a telephone call from the Examiner is solicited.

By: 

Mark Clodfelter, Agent of Record  
Registration number: 34,564  
Customer Number: 20115  
PATENT SERVICES  
555 Sparkman Drive  
Huntsville, Ala. 35758  
Tel. (256) 895-8339